

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed August 2, 2007. Claims 1-3, 5-23, 25-38, 40-48, 50-54, 57 and 58 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 21, 34 and 45 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-15, 18, 21, 23, 25-29, 31, 34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 45, 47, 48, 50, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodrill, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 7,069,309, hereinafter “Dodrill”) in view of Yunzhou Li, (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0071442, hereinafter “Yunzhou Li”) in view of Jim Li, (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,088, hereinafter “Jim Li”) and further in view of Hemzal, (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,595, hereinafter “Hemzal”). Claims 2, 22, 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Dodrill, Li, Jim Li and Hemzal and further in view of Cohen, (U.S. Patent No. 4,837,798, hereinafter “Cohen”).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Dodrill, Li, Jim Li and Hemzal, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Elliott, (U.S. Patent No. 7,145,898, hereinafter “Elliott”). Claims 17, 30, 43 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Dodrill, Li, Jim Li and Hemzal, as applied to claims 1, 21 and 34 above, and further in view of Lewish, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,661, hereinafter “Lewish”). Claims 19, 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Dodrill, Li, Jim Li and Hemzal, as applied to claims 1, 21 and 34 above, and further in

view of Anuff, (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628, hereinafter “Anuff”). Claims 20, 33, 44 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Dodrill, Li, Jim Li and Hemzal, as applied to claims 1, 21 and 34 above, and further in view of Olsen, (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,642, hereinafter “Olsen”). Claims 42, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Dodrill, Li, Jim Li and Hemzal, as applied to claims 34 and 40 above, and further in view of Huebsch, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 7,127,535, hereinafter “Huebsch”).

With respect to Dodrill, the presently claimed invention predates the Dodrill reference because the presently claimed invention was reduced to practice prior to October 19, 2000, i.e., the effective filing date of the Dodrill reference. The Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 is submitted herewith to swear behind the Dodrill reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner no longer consider the Dodrill reference as prior art for the presently claimed invention.

With respect to Yunzhou Li, the effective filing date of this reference is December 7, 2000. As discussed above, the presently claimed invention was reduced to practice prior to October 19, 2000, i.e., before the effective filing date of the Yunzhou Li reference. Consequently, the presently claimed invention predates the Yunzhou Li reference. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner no longer consider the Yunzhou Li reference as prior art for the presently claimed invention.

With respect to Jim Li, it discloses automatically configuring an Internet access device using configuration data downloaded from a configuration server. Contrary to the presently claimed invention, Jim Li does not teach or suggest validating configuration information pertaining to alert messages to be sent to multiple destinations via different notification methods, the configuration information being specified by at least one user

for multiple business sites, and then storing the configuration information in a database that associates each destination with one or more notification methods. Neither does Jim Li teach or suggest extracting at least a subset of the configuration information from the database based on an extraction parameter identifying one business site, and generating a text-based configuration file containing the extracted configuration information, as claimed in the present invention. Accordingly, Jim Li lacks all the features of the present invention claimed in claims 1, 21, 34 and 45.

The above features of the present invention are also missing from each of Hemzal, Cohen, Elliott, Lewish, Anuff, Olsen, and Huebsch. Therefore, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 21, 34 and 45, and their corresponding dependent claims including claims 16, 17, 19, 20, 30, 32-35, 40, 42-44, and 51-54.

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marina Portnova  
Registration No. 45,750

Dated: October 12, 2007

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 84085-4040  
(408) 720-8300